

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on May 17, 2010.

Claims 25-48 are currently pending in this application, with claim 25 being independent.

No new matter has been added.

Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections

i. The rejected claims have been canceled.

While not conceding the propriety of the claim rejections, and in order to advance the prosecution of the instant application, the rejected claims have been canceled.

Newly added claims

ii. Claims 26-48 are dependent upon claim 25.

Claim 25 is drawn to a polyester film roll comprising:

a roll of polyester film, said polyester film being rolled onto a core,

wherein said core has a maximum outer diameter and a minimum outer diameter, the difference between said maximum and minimum outer diameters of the core being not more than 300×10^{-6} m.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0069885, the publication document for the instant application, provides the following in paragraph [0021]:

When the outer diameters of the roll shape of the core are measured in the width direction of the core, the difference (Rc) between the maximum value and the minimum value is preferably not more than $300 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$, further preferably $200 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$.

A. U.S. Patent No. 4,576,344 to Sasaki et al. (Sasaki) is silent as to the difference between the maximum and minimum outer diameters of the core being not more than $300 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$.

Referring to FIG. 1, a polyester film 1 is fed from a film supply roll (not shown in FIG. 1) and is wound around a core 2 through a touch roll 3 so as to form a film roll 4 (Sasaki at column 4, lines 54-57).

However, Sasaki fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the difference between the maximum and minimum outer diameters of the core (2) of Sasaki being not more than $300 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$.

B. U.S. Patent No. 4,911,951 to Sasaki et al. (Ogawa) is silent as to the difference between the maximum and minimum outer diameters of the core being not more than $300 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$.

The material thus coated and dried is then subjected immediately to a calendering treatment in the calendering means 7 and then dried completely at a temperature of from 50° to 150°C in the second drying means 8 and wound up by means of the winding up role 9 (Ogawa at column 5, lines 7-13).

However, Ogawa *fails* to disclose, teach, or suggest the winding up role 9 having a core, wherein the difference between the maximum and minimum outer diameters of the core for the winding up role 9 of Ogawa is not more than 300×10^{-6} m.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification has been amended as set forth in the Substitute Specification.

Official Notice

There is no concession as to the veracity of Official Notice, if taken in any Office Action.

An affidavit or document should be provided in support of any Official Notice taken. 37 C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2), M.P.E.P. §2144.03. See also, *Ex parte Natale*, 11 USPQ2d 1222, 1227-1228 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989)(failure to provide any objective evidence to support the challenged use of Official Notice constitutes clear and reversible error).

Extensions of time

Please treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

Fees

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Conclusion

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.

Applicants reserve the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

Dated: July 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Brian K. Dutton

Registration No.: 47,255

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant